ROD McCULLUM: I'm Rod McCullum, Director of NEI's Yucca Mountain project in Washington. I've been following this repository program for about eight years now.

I work with Paul very closely out here, and I'm glad to welcome him as a colleague on the Nevada end. I think that is a testament to how seriously we in the nuclear industry take this project.

1 It is indeed a project of great national importance. We feel that Yucca Mountain is an important part of what we like to call an integrated use fuel management strategy. We safely manage our used fuel on site. We safely and routinely transport it.

We have loaded over 900 of the nuclear waste containers outside of our pools in our plants that are very similar to the technologies that will be used here in the TADs and in Yucca Mountain.

We are very -- I was very glad to hear folks talking about the resource value. We are interested in reprocessing, perhaps interim storage somewhere, and certainly disposal at Yucca Mountain, all very important pieces of doing something that is very important to America.

Nuclear energy provides 20 percent of our electricity. It does so without contributing climate change or releasing other pollutants in the air. And I think nowhere more so than in Nevada where the lights are very bright and the air conditioners hum all year

round is the value of affordable, reliable, and clean electricity appreciated.

And Nye County certainly has an opportunity to become part of that. I'm very glad to be out here to share a few words about industry's perspective on these SEIS's, which we very much welcome. We're very glad that DOE has provided the opportunity for public input and comment on that for something as important as this project is.

I'm very glad to be out here to share industry's views, as well as, of course, hear the views of the people of Nye County and Nevada. As I will be working on the formal comments industry will submit, it's important that we hear those.

I think if I could briefly summarize industry's position in just one word on the SDEIS, that would be improvements. This is definitely a necessary update that we think will facilitate the licensing process.

It's improved in two areas. The operational aspects of the repository, we feel from our standpoint having a lot of experience with used fuel operations have been vastly simplified.

We have worked very closely with the department on the TAD concept line, which I can certainly say is a lot more than a concept. A lot of significant design and engineering work has gone into this. DOE has issued a final specification for the TAD this summer for vendors, for vendors in the industry,

the same vendors that have been building those 900 casks of used fuel we have stored on our sites.

I've completed a group of concept designs and submitted proposals to procure demonstrations to have TADs on the ground loaded and ready to come to Yucca Mountain with whatever age fuel is appropriate as early as 2012, certainly in time for the repository to be open in 2017 or later.

It's improved from that operational standpoint. We are very much on board with that. We are very much anticipating and continuing to do so. It's also improved from the analytical tools used to evaluate Yucca Mountain. Long-term proponents in protecting public health and safety have improved.

This SDEIS has taken what we've learned with additional years of science in the last five or so years and has reanalyzed and reevaluated, and it shows that the mountain will be even safer than we thought it would be with the less advanced tools we had five years ago.

We're now projecting in these SDEIS's that radiation doses to future populations for an entire year within the Yucca Mountain site will be less than what I will receive on the round-trip plane flight to come out here and make these comments. I don't feel at risk in doing that, at least not the radiation I get up there in the air.

Some would say how can you predict for a million years? I would say, yeah, you can't absolutely

predict a million years, but we feel very strongly that the analysis that came up with that projection of those types of radiation exposures, that type of safety, that type of protection is very conservative.

We actually have our own independent science from the EPRI, Electric Power Research Institute, that would indicate that those results are very conservative. We see a lot of things in the SDEIS where DOE has erred on the side of conservatism. And I think a significant part of our comments will be to talk about our perspective from our independent view of how conservative that science is.

So we look forward to taking this information. This information is a precursor step to a very rigorous, very thorough licensing process, an opportunity for more public input, an opportunity for those who doubt the repository safety to challenge it and to have those challenges adjudicated and before impartial judges, basically put the project on trial.

We think that when you look at the substantial amount of information that is in this SDEIS, that this is a good start for the licensing process. We'd like to get in that licensing process, see that information challenged, adjudicated. We'll be participating.

I will cover transportation safety. I don't have the time to go into that. However, I will say that we have a lot of experience with that, and we're looking forward to getting that railroad built as soon as possible so we can get the used fuel to Yucca Mountain

in the best and safest manner possible. Thank you.